<u>REMARKS</u>

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4, 7-9. 11-15, 17, 19, 20, 23-26, 29-38, 40, and 41 are currently pending

- Claims 25, 31, 32, 36, and 37 are canceled herein

- Claims 1, 12, 20, 26, and 33 are amended herein

[0003] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 12, 20, 26 and 33 can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [00122] to [00128].

Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Sheasby**: Sheasby et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,539,163

- **Day**: Day et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

[0005] Claims 12-15, 17, 19, 20, 23-26, 29-38, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sheasby. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 12

[0006]   Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 12 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter.   Amended claim 12 now recites (emphasis added):

> ***configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node,*** the change performing at least one of the following:
>> changing to a property of the at least one node;
>> adding one or more additional nodes as a child to the at least one node;
>> removing one or more nodes that are children of the at least one node;
>> adding an effect to the at least one node; and
>> removing an effect from the at least one node;
>> loading each software component described by a first collection;
>> executing each software component described by the first collection; and
>> loading each software component described by a second collection.

[0007]   Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-implemented method is disclosed by Sheasby.   Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection Applicant herein amends independent claim 12 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Applicant's amended claim 12 recites "configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node." Applicant respectfully submits that Sheasby cannot be said to

disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 12. Rather, Sheasby describes a non-linear editor for constructing edit sequences including reference clips. *See, Sheasby,* Abstract. The reference clip includes a reference to the underlying child sequence that it represents. *See, Sheasby,* Col. 4, lines 41-42. If the metadata defining a child sequence is modified after one or more reference clips to that child sequence have been employed in a parent sequence, the next time the parent sequence is played, the modified metadata of the child sequence will be used. *See, Sheasby,* Col. 6, lines 13-18. As each reference of a reference clip stores the location of the metadata for the child sequence, replacing the child sequence with the newer version in effect publishes the newer version for use by all reference clips that referred to the original version. Alternatively, each version can be made available to users to allow them to select the version they wish to use. *See, Sheasby,* Col. 6, lines 46-53. This cannot be said to teach "configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node," as recited in Applicant's amended claim 12.

[0008] As Sheasby fails to disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is not anticipated by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0009] **Dependent claims 13-15, 17, and 19** depend from independent claim 12 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Dependent claims 13-15, 17, and 19 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with

those recited in claim 12, are not disclosed by Sheasby.   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 20

[0010]   Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 20 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter.   Amended claim 20 now recites (emphasis added):

> the media timeline includes a plurality of nodes, wherein the plurality of nodes comprises at least one of a parent node and a child node, configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline **while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node**.

[0011]   Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable storage media is disclosed by Sheasby and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 12.   For example, Sheasby fails to disclose "configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node," as disclosed in Applicant's amended claim 20.

[0012]   As Sheasby fails to disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is not anticipated by Sheasby.   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0013]   **Dependent claims 23 and 24** depend from independent claim 20 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Dependent claims 23 and 24

are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 20, are not disclosed by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 26

[0014]   Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 26 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 26 now recites:

> the media timeline includes a plurality of nodes;
> at least two nodes reference respective media;
> and
> ***at least one node is configured for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node.***

[0015]   Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed by Sheasby and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 12. For example, Sheasby fails to disclose at least "one node is configured for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node," as disclosed in Applicant's amended claim 26.

[0016]   As Sheasby fails to disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 is not anticipated by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0017]   **Dependent claims 29 and 30** depend from independent claim 26 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Dependent claims 29 and 30 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited

in claim 26, are not disclosed by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 33

[0018] Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 33 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 33 now recites (emphasis added):

> means for dividing a media timeline into one or more presentations each describing a rendering of one or more media during a particular interval of time, wherein the media timeline exposes a plurality of nodes to a plurality of applications, wherein one or more nodes reference respective said media, and wherein the media timeline is configured for dynamic loading such that metadata included in at least one node specifies a collection of nodes to be loaded when the media timeline is rendered, wherein the rendered media timeline is presented on an output device, ***wherein at least one node is configured for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to a property of the at least one node while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node.***

[0019] Applicant respectfully submits that no such timeline source is disclosed by Sheasby and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 12. For example, Sheasby fails to disclose at least "wherein at least one node is configured for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to a property of the at least one node while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least the parent node," as recited in Applicant's amended claim 33.

[0020] As Sheasby fails to disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 33, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 33 is not anticipated by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0021] **Dependent claim 34, 38, 40, and 41** depend from independent claim 33 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Dependent claims 34, 38, 40, and 41 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 33, are not disclosed by Sheasby. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

[0022] Claims 1, 4, 7-9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Sheasby in view of Day. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0023] *Independent Claim 1*

[0024] Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 1 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 1 now recites (emphasis added):

> configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is ***rendered and communicated to at least a parent node***, wherein the rendered media timeline is presented on an output device

[0025] Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-implemented method is disclosed, taught, or suggested by either Sheasby and/or Day, either alone or in combination. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection Applicant herein amends independent claim 1 to clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Applicant's amended claim 1 recites "configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to at least a parent node, wherein the rendered media timeline is presented on an output device." Applicant respectfully submits that Sheasby cannot be said to disclose the features of Applicant's amended claim 1. Rather, Sheasby describes a non-linear editor for constructing edit sequences including reference clips. *See,* Sheasby, Abstract. The reference clip includes a reference to the underlying child sequence that it represents. *See,* Sheasby, Col. 4, lines 41-42. If the metadata defining a child sequence is modified after one or more reference clips to that child sequence have been employed in a parent sequence, the next time the parent sequence is played, the modified metadata of the child sequence will be used. *See,* Sheasby, Col. 6, lines 13-18. As each reference of a reference clip stores the location of the metadata for the child sequence, replacing the child sequence with the newer version in effect publishes the newer version for use by all reference clips that referred to the original version. Alternatively, each version can be made available to users to allow them to select the version they wish to use. *See,* Sheasby, Col. 6, lines 46-53. This cannot be said to teach "configuring at least one node for communication of events to another node such that a change may be made to the media timeline while the media timeline is rendered and communicated to

at least a parent node, wherein the rendered media timeline is presented on an output device," as recited in Applicant's amended claim 1.

[0026] Applicant respectfully submits that Day fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Sheasby. Rather, Day teaches a a plurality of multimedia files seamlessly concatenated on the fly to enable a continuous presentation of the multimedia files. *See,* Day, Summary. A seamless sequential playlist is assembled from the selected and commonized segments and the resources needed to deliver and play the playlist are reserved in advance to assure resource availability for continuous transmission and execution of the playlist. *See,* Day, Summary. At a predetermined point prior to an end point of each multimedia segment, the next selected segment is initialized and aligned in memory in preparation for a seamless switch to the next segment at the end of a previous segment, thereby providing a seamless flow of data and a continuous presentation of a plurality of selected multimedia files to a client system in such a way that the multimedia data received is assembled from multiple separate file segments. *See,* Day, Summary.

[0027] Thus, Sheasby and/or Day, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejections made under § 103 and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

[0028] **Dependent claims 4, 7-9, and 11** depend from independent claim 1 and thus are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

[0029] Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

[0030] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0031] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Kristina M. Kuhnert/   Dated: March 1, 2010

Kristina M. Kuhnert
(kristi@leehayes.com; 509-944-4717)
Registration No. 62665

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35061